

DNCT Meeting Notes
11/10/98

Agenda:

- i. Scenario descriptions.
- ii. Water supply effects

Action Items

- 1. **Action:** Dave F., Bruce, and Elise agreed to work out some language for describing C and D.
- 2. **Action:** Russ will run Hood diversion, variable San Luis carryover, and lesser demands.

Highlights

- I. Discussed summary table scenarios.
- II. Discussed preliminary model runs.

Draft Summary Table describing scenarios

- 1. B.J. is concerned about displaying Accord + Full AFRP as baseline. Team agreed to take that row out of table.
- 2. Team discussed differences between C and D:
- 3. C is a self help scenario.
- 4. C is salaried; D is hourly
- 5. D is not determined by implementing No-Name tools
- 6. Language should be same as in Scenario paper.
- 7. **Action:** Dave F., Bruce, and Elise agreed to work out some language for describing C and D.
- 8. Bruce: Which style of fish protection seems to be main difference in scenarios.

Russ's Model Results for A and E.

- 9. Elise: What level of fish salvage reduction does model run of E provide? Russ: 25-50%.
- 10. Russ: New facilities would provide further benefits since water is shared.
- 11. Ron on A results: fish measures seem to cost 800 TAF, but 400TAF made up through relaxed E/I and Full Pumps. Russ: yes.
- 12. Mike T: demands are artificially too high in model runs, and carryover in San Luis is not considered.
- 13. Chet: concerned about demands, but 500 TAF start in San Luis is OK.
- 14. Elise: Why pick 89 for 6 MAF of demand? Russ: highest historic demand.
- 15. Was AFRP actions included? Russ: not included.
- 16. Bruce: (1) AFRP will do some of Scenario A; (2) concerned about the carryover assumption for San Luis in model; (3) concerned about effect of too high a level of

- demand.
17. Sprect: (1) we compare to past deliveries most of time. Use the models to characterize difference between scenarios. (2) Because Russ is not reoperating with upstream reservoirs he may overestimate slightly the water costs.
 18. Russ: yes there may be limited opportunity to save some of the water (in cases where releases are being made to meet standards).
 19. Dave F: suggests doing model runs with sequential storage at San Luis. Russ: will do.
 20. Greg: demand level needs to be decided upon. Is it 6 MAF; 5 MAF with a downstream reservoir? 400 TAF from relaxation of E/I and new pumps seems about right.
 21. Elise: there are other ways to meet demands - 6 MAF shows a bias picture to management.
 22. Mike T: (1) how demand is met is an issue; (2) Russ's model has no trigger to minimize new standards, thus overestimates water supply cost; (3) need to carefully describe results with appropriate upfront caveats.
 23. Sushil: SWRBC use 5.5 to 6.2 MAF as demand; varies by year. We should put the variable demand in model.
 24. Bruce: Has a problem with using 1989 demands because the WQCP was not in place. May not matter, but we should try to model as realistically as possible.
 25. This model output is a "horse of a different color" - it is not the type of output we are normally presented.
 26. Dave F: should make three changes: (1) sequence of San Luis; (2) demand level; and (3) sensitivity analysis.
 27. Chet: DWRSIM studies are needed. Too risky to estimate water supply cost without DWRSIM.
 28. Greg: What are we trying to show: differences between scenarios at ball park level?
 29. Bruce: Can't rely on DWRSIM. Our flex ops doesn't lend itself to modelling tools. We won't get water cost estimates, so what do we do?
 30. Ron: two options will be run by Russ - sequential and demand level.
 31. Dave F: Russ's model runs are useful.
 32. B.J.: The demand levels are 6 MAF. If Scenario A only provides 5 MAF of exports, then water users will have to do something to make up the difference.
 33. Elise: the demand level is irrelevant; there are other tools available to meet water demand other than exports from the Delta. There is an overemphasis on water supply costs because the model overestimates water supply costs.
 34. Mike T: Russ's tools have value, but they overinflate water supply cost; input sequence is not real; and not sure if the model accurately represents the new standards and potential relaxations.
 35. Russ: The model simply shows the basic limitations of export hydrology.
 36. B.J.: Scenario E has the same water deliveries at the Accord but reduces fish salvage by 25-50%.
 37. Greg: these scenarios simply refocus our export distributions to save fish.
 38. Bruce: some encouraging things from the model: (1) we can get a relatively large environmental water account; (2) the scenarios seem workable.

39. Shushil: Scenario C provides about 400 TAF on average and 200 TAF in dry years through relaxations and larger pumps.
40. Pete C: Still is not comfortable with model results, because we can't accurately model all the features in the scenarios.
41. B.J.: Both models tell us that we can get about 400 TAF for the env account. We just have to determine how to use that water.
42. Bruce: 400 TAF can buy a lot of protection.
43. Bruce: We should be able to make three scenarios out of our five.
44. Ron: we can make any of these work.
45. Greg: E trades of directly, as does C and D. A may not work - may not provide sufficient water even with undefined relaxations.
46. Pete C: Need more water supply developed for A.
47. Bruce: the A model run does not include relaxation rules for the new standards.
48. Pete C: What we want to accomplish is similar in A and C, so they should both be similar.
49. Ron: water supply reliability is lower in A.
50. Dave F: we need more water supply development in A.
51. B.J.: we need to lay out A in more detail to see how it would work.
52. Bruce/Elise: we need to get NNG working on water supply aspects of these scenarios. Can the water hits from new standards be smoothed out? How will the Hood diversion help with meeting the scenario A QWEST standards? **Action: Russ will run.**
53. Greg: NNG tools only provide 300-400 TAF in Stage 1 - you will need all of them for these scenarios.
54. Bruce: Hood diversion with low head pump will add QWEST. DEFT needs to develop triggers that balance with NNG tools. Integrating NNG tools with DEFT tools is important. Daily model runs are insightful, but need DWRSIM too.
55. Greg: does not see the need to integrate.
56. Shushil: modelling takes time.
57. Elise: DEFT identified risks and need for protection. NNG needs to define tools to match these needs.
58. Greg: we only have two tools: storage and exports. The rest is simply rules. Doesn't make sense to match NNG tools with DEFT tools.
59. Pete C: we are short in A about 200 TAF- thats a big issue.
60. Bruce: we can save water and fish with linking the tools.
61. Greg: different tools have no effect. NNG can do op studies, then new storage, then exchanges and transfers. With what we got for rules, we can now define how much water we can get through the Delta. We can show how storage will work with the different rules. Then look at how exchanges and transfers will work. Steps: rules for ops; add storage; then exchange/transfers.